

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

Applicant	Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority	Amount Requested	\$1,472,877
Proposal Title	Dixon Watershed Management Plan	Total Proposal Cost	\$3,205,754

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located in Solano County, southeast of the City of Dixon. The project will increase the stormwater flow capacity in the most downstream channels of the Eastside Drainage tributary area. The Dixon Main Drain along Swan Road and the V-Drain between Swan Road and the RD 2068 Canal is proposed for deepening and widening. Subsequent to excavation, the area will be planted with native species and fenced from livestock to enhance habitat, improve water quality, and reduce erosion.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	8/10
Budget	4/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	9/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			47

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criteria is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation. The project is the first phase of a larger project. The application does not include an adequate discussion of the interdependencies of the two projects. The application makes reference to a certified EIR but does not discuss the resulting CEQA/NEPA determination and comments, nor is the document provided for reference. The applicant clearly demonstrates the need, goals, and objectives of the proposed project. The applicant provides the status of each task and phase. The task descriptions provide a detailed level of information to address how the project will be implemented.

BUDGET

The budget provided includes detailed cost information that appears to be reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the budget categories is not fully supported. There is no supporting documentation for lump sums shown in Table 4A under Task 9.

SCHEDULE

The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, appears to be reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction by October 2014. Construction will begin in May 2014.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant does not provide a numeric targets or discuss appropriate measurement tools for the claimed benefits of water quality improvement, reduced in-stream erosion, or reduced flow velocities during storm events.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but is not fully supported by documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. Fecal coliform loading and sediment transport attributed to livestock grazing in the channel are not quantified. The justification for the claimed benefits of water reuse and water quality are discussed briefly but no quantitative information is provided.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Project cost is \$3.32 million in Net Present Value (NPV).

It is difficult to determine the adequacy of the data used. Little to no explanation of methods or data is provided in Attachment 8 except for titles and footnotes to tables. Quantified Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) benefits are primarily avoided damage to cropland and its infrastructure. Other avoided damage includes that to livestock barns and a few residences. It appears that information from the FEMA BCA model was used to estimate benefits. The project is a component of a larger regional watershed management plan.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that 3 program preferences and 3 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. The applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for all the Preferences claimed. The proposal will achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions; 3) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; 4) Climate Change Response Actions; 5) Expand Environmental Stewardship; 6) Practice Integrated Flood Management; and 7) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality